

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
United States Attorney  
ARIN C. HEINZ  
Assistant United States Attorney  
2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401  
Fresno, CA 93721  
Telephone: (559) 497-4080  
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CASE NO. 1:22-CR-00291-JLT-SKO

Plaintiff,

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO VACATE  
STATUS CONFERENCE AND SET TRIAL**

V.

JONATHAN LOPEZ,

Defendant.

## BACKGROUND

This case is set for status conference on November 15, 2023. The parties request the status conference be vacated and a trial be scheduled to begin on March 19, 2024, with a trial confirmation hearing on March 4, 2024. The Supreme Court has emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act's end-of-justice provision "counteract[s] substantive openendedness with procedural strictness," "demand[ing] on-the-record findings" in a particular case. *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). "[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no exclusion under" § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record "either orally or in writing").

Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the

1 public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is  
2 excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or  
3 finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of  
4 the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

5 In light of the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding  
6 excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7)  
7 (Local Code T4). If continued, this Court should designate a new date for the status conference. *United*  
8 *States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be  
9 “specifically limited in time”).

10 **STIPULATION**

11 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and  
12 through defendant’s counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

13 1. By previous order, this matter was set for a status conference on November 15, 2023.

14 2. By this stipulation, the defendant moves to vacate the November 15, 2023 status

15 conference, and to exclude time between November 15, 2023 and March 19, 2024 under 18 U.S.C.  
16 § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4].

17 3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

18 a) The government provided discovery to the defense on November 18, 2022. The discovery  
19 consists of numerous recorded jailhouse phone calls, investigative reports, photographs,  
20 and other information.

21 b) The government provided supplemental discovery on October 30, 2023, in response to  
22 defense requests. The defense requests additional time to review the supplemental  
23 discovery and conduct ongoing investigation.

24 c) The Government provided a revised plea offer to defense counsel on November 2, 2023.  
25 Defense counsel requests additional discuss the offer with her client, and the parties  
26 require additional time to engage in further negotiations.

27 d) The government does not object to the continuance.

28 e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the case as

1 requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the  
2 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

3 f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq.,  
4 within which trial must commence, the time period from November 15, 2023, to March  
5 19, 2024 inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv)  
6 [Local Code T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at  
7 defendant's request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by  
8 taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy  
9 trial.

10 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the  
11 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial  
12 must commence

13 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

14 Dated: November 8, 2023

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
United States Attorney

16 /s/ ARIN C. HEINZ  
17 ARIN C. HEINZ  
18 Assistant United States Attorney

19 Dated: November 8, 2023

20 /s/ CHRISTINA M. CORCORAN  
21 Christina M. Corcoran  
Counsel for Defendant  
Jonathan Lopez

24 ORDER

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

27 DATED: 11/9/23

*Sheila K. Oberto*

28 THE HONORABLE SHEILA K. OBERTO  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE